

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/919,235	REDPATH, RICHARD J.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Lamont M. Spooner	2654	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Lamont M. Spooner. (3)\_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Stephen Tkacs. (4)\_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 15 September 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 7 and 24.

Identification of prior art discussed: Moser et al..


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiners amendment, cancel all claims except 7 and 24, which overcome Moser et al, by applicant argument over Moser, regarding an option which specifies use of a linguistic annotation language, the mark-up language as an annotation language, specification p.13, para. 2, 35 USC 112 rejection withdrawn as fig. 6 details an option which specifies use of a linguistic annotation language, the mark-up language as an annotation language, specification p.13, para. 21. .